Northern District of California

| UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT |
|---------------------------------|
| NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA |

J. C.,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Plaintiff,

v.

CAMBRIAN SCHOOL DISTRICT, et al., Defendants.

Case No. 12-cv-03513-WHO

ORDER CONCERNING DISCOVERY **DISPUTES**

Re: Dkt. Nos. 37, 47

On November 8, 2013, plaintiff's counsel filed a 2-page letter identifying four discovery disputes. Defendants responded on November 18, 2013. After consideration of the arguments presented, the Court orders:

- 1. Plaintiffs may take the deposition of Jayne Selig at the earliest date convenient to Ms. Selig and counsel. It appears that plaintiffs had identified her as a relevant witness, that her deposition had been scheduled within the discovery period, and that the failure to take the deposition within the discovery period resulted from miscommunication between the parties after the original date for the deposition was postponed for good cause.
- 2. Defendants have filed an amended response to Request No. 22 which states that no responsive document exist, or have ever existed. If this response was verified, defendants need do nothing further. If it was not, defendants should verify the response.
- 3. Defendants have agreed to produce the Intra-district Transfer Permits sought by plaintiffs. The Request was apparently dated July 24, 2013. The Court orders that this production occur as quickly as possible, and no later than December 13, 2013.

Case 3:12-cv-03513-WHO Document 48 Filed 11/22/13 Page 2 of 2

United States District Court Northern District of California

| 4. | Defendants do not address the fourth dispute, which leads the Court to hope that the |
|----|--|
| | inspection schedule referred to in plaintiffs' letter has been agreed upon. |

The Court notes that defendants have filed a motion for summary judgment. Assuming that the discovery allowed above is material to plaintiffs' opposition to the motion, the parties should complete the discovery allowed at the earliest possible time. Further, the parties should stipulate to a hearing date that allows plaintiffs to respond on the merits rather than to seek a continuance until they have obtained said discovery.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: November 22, 2013



WILLIAM H. ORRICK United States District Judge